



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

STANDARDIZATION OF SALARIES AND GRADES IN CIVIL SERVICE¹

ROBERT MOSES

Bureau of Municipal Research of New York City

The purpose of salary standardization is briefly:

To furnish a simple and logical classification of all employments, with general descriptions of duties, appropriate titles and rates of compensation, qualifications and conditions governing advancement, for purposes of appropriation, financial and civil service control, information to present and prospective employes and to the public. Salary standardization would be a relatively simple thing if a single government agency, backed by a strong executive, were empowered to develop a new classification and put it into effect. This, however, is not generally the fact. For example, the following agencies are involved directly or indirectly with salary and grade standardization in New York City:

1. The state legislative body which has the power to make laws governing the organization of departments, the fixation of mandatory salaries, etc.

2. The board of estimate and apportionment, which initiates all appropriations and prepares the budget.

3. The board of aldermen which passes upon the budget as presented by the board of estimate, which may reduce this budget and which consequently has the final power to establish or to refuse to establish positions.

4. The civil service commission which as the official employment agent and personnel board for the city, controls the entrance of the employe into the service and his subsequent promotion,

¹ A paper read at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association in Washington, D. C., December 29, 1915.

fixes titles and controls the performance of work under these titles.

5. The state civil service commission which is empowered to investigate the acts of municipal commissioners and to remove the commissioners on charges, and whose consent must be obtained before there can be any changes in the rules of the municipal commission.

6. The mayor to whom, as executive over the majority of city departments, the heads of these departments are responsible; the comptroller as head of the finance department; and the borough presidents who, as administrative heads of the borough governments, have the control of policies affecting the personnel under their jurisdiction, subject to such limitation as may be fixed by the authorities mentioned above. They submit the original budget requests upon which the board of estimate acts and make the original recommendations governing promotion and advancement. The consent of the mayor as well as that of the state civil service commission must be obtained before any changes can be made in the rules of the municipal civil service commission.

There are similar overlapping agencies which control personnel in almost every government unit. In state governments, the legislature is more active and powerful in controlling personnel, especially where no executive budget system has been built up. In small cities where civil service control is not so well established and where the mayor, council or city manager control the government more directly, there are fewer checks and balances and fewer overlapping agencies.

Standardization of salaries and grades has had practically the same objects and a similar history in all government agencies since the Chicago civil service commission began this work some years ago. It will suffice to give a brief history of this work in New York City, which is just completing its standardization program. This history is not dry and dull as some may suppose from reading printed salary schedules, but is of very real interest to all students of government. A student who wishes to see city government as a whole and all classes of city employees at work, who wishes to observe the cumulative results of mis-government

and extravagance in the past, and to feel the undercurrents of politics and the influence of public opinion, will find no more interesting and suggestive field of study than that afforded by a standardization program.

Standardization of salaries and grades of New York City employes was initiated through a resolution offered to the board of estimate and apportionment by the borough president of Manhattan, Mr. McAneny, at a meeting of the board on October 31, 1910. In accordance with the above resolution, a committee was appointed by the mayor and an appropriation of \$35,000 to carry on this work was included in the budget for 1911. Although repeated efforts were made by the bureau of municipal research during the year 1911 to have the work as outlined undertaken, nothing was done during that year. Toward the end of the year 1911, Mr. McAneny and Mr. Mitchel offered resolutions urging the immediate commencement of the work of standardizing salaries and grades, scientific budget work, a school inquiry, etc. The board of estimate made an appropriation for this purpose, which the board of aldermen refused to pass. The mayor failed to veto the board of alderman's action and consequently the 1912 budget contained no appropriation for salary standardization work. During the spring of 1912, an informal study was made of the finance department for purposes of salary standardization. Later a sub-committee of the main committee was appointed together with representatives of the civil service commission and the bureau of municipal research to continue the standardization study begun in the finance department, and the board of estimate passed a resolution authorizing the transfer of \$25,000 to carry on the work.

A staff was organized in the fall of 1912. During the first six months, the committee, its advisers and its examiners devoted their time to gathering basic information, drawing up tentative specifications and doing other work incidental to the proper launching of the program. During the next year the work of the committee was not prosecuted with the same energy as during the first six months. This was due, in part, to defects in personnel, organization, direction and procedure, and in part to

obstacles encountered in dealing with officers and employees in the various departments. Considerable progress was made in the preparation of the personal service cards, but because of inherent defects in the description of duties on the cards and because many were inaccurate and others were allowed to become obsolete, the general result was that they could not be used either for standard specifications, organization charts or final appraisals. Up to this time there was no agreement on a proper classification; no first-hand study had been made of the various groups of city employees; no program of conference with these employees and with superior officers had been arranged; no agreement had been reached as to proper grades and salaries or as to the principles which should govern increases within grades. Organization charts were prepared in great detail before any definite plan had been adopted either as to the principles which should govern their preparation or as to the uses to which they were to be put. Before half the departments had been charted, the first charts had become obsolete and no method had been adopted for bringing them up to date. As a net result the greater part of the work of this year had to be done over again.

In the spring of 1914, the bureau of standards of the board of estimate and apportionment was created and all the work of the salary standardization committee as well as the staff of the committee was transferred to it. Shortly after the establishment of the bureau of standards, the bureau of municipal research began an active coöperation in its work, which has continued up to the present time. In October, 1914, a resolution was included in the terms and conditions of the budget providing:

1. "That vacancies . . . shall be filled only after certificate by the duly authorized representatives of the board of estimate and apportionment, that the title and compensation for such vacant positions conform to the standard title, work specifications and compensation grades fixed by the board of estimate and apportionment."

2. "That no modification of any schedule supporting an appropriation for salaries . . . shall be made except when authorized by resolution of the board of estimate and apportion-

ment in conformity with standard titles, work specifications and compensation grades which may be or have been approved by said board."

In November, 1914, the director of the bureau of standards rendered his first report to the committee on salaries and grades, containing in detail a plan for the classification and standardization of employments in the city of New York. This report urged the need of prompt action on the part of the board of estimate. No action was taken by the board on this report. In March, 1915, the director of the bureau of standards submitted another report, urging consideration by the board of estimate of the specifications prepared and in process of preparation by the bureau of standards, and requesting the board to appropriate sufficient money for printing the specifications at a cost not exceeding \$2,000. Several months passed without action on the part of the board of estimate, causing much valuable time to be lost. It was not until July, 1915 that the printing of the professional service was formally approved. During the summer considerable progress was made in completing and publishing specifications, but after the first of September work on the budget began and continued until the first of November.

During the preceding year a definite work program had been adopted and carried out. This had involved:

The adoption of a proper classification of services and groups.

The gathering of field information regarding each group of employees.

The preparation of standard specifications based on this information.

The holding of conferences with representatives of the departments and employees concerned for the purpose of improving and revising specifications.

The gathering of information regarding salaries paid for and conditions relating to similar service in private employment.

The carrying on of a voluminous correspondence with department heads and other superior officers regarding the principles of standardization and their specific application in the various services, groups and grades.

The collection and preparation of data supporting the standard specifications, including a report on a minimum wage for unskilled laborers, to accompany the specifications for the street cleaning service, a report on the hospital helper situation and its remedy to accompany the specifications for the institutional service, etc.

The preparation of reports to the committee on salaries and grades on the filling of vacancies in all positions in the city service, in accordance with the tentative standard specifications. The revision of personal service cards and charts in all departments, the making of final appraisals of positions, and the preparation of memoranda and material on the proper working units of employees in the various departments to be used in the preparation of the 1916 budget.

It was decided to divide all employments into the following services:

Executive, legislative, judicial, professional, sub-professional, educational, investigational, inspectional, clerical, custodial, street cleaning, fire, police, institutional, skilled trades and labor.

The reasons for such a division readily suggest themselves. These are not the only possible divisions, but they seemed to be those which were best suited to the needs of New York City. It will be seen that although the theory of standardization is that the divisions are along functional rather than departmental lines, it was not possible to maintain this distinction in all cases.

The executive service was set up to include only the executive heads of departments, in all cases elective or appointive officers. It was, however, specifically provided that the secretaries of departments who are at present exempt officers should in future be classified as competitive in order to provide for a high permanent official in each department, who should not be affected by a change in administration, whose duties should not be policy-determining, but administrative and interpretative, who should be able to coördinate the various activities of the bureaus of the department and to inform the new commissioner and his deputies on all details of departmental administration.

The legislative service was to include the board of aldermen,

and the judicial service, the judges. Up to the present time no recommendation as to salary has been made for these services. They were included more for the purpose of providing a complete classification of all employees than with any immediate purpose or prospect of changing the present salaries. They may be completed at any time in future.

The professional service was set up to include only members of the recognized professions with the intention that such high qualifications of professional training and experience should be established as to clearly differentiate this service from the sub-professional service. The sub-professional service was to include assistants of the professions, such as draftsman, laboratory assistants, law clerks, etc., who should have an opportunity to graduate into the professional ranks but should not be classified or paid on a professional basis.

The educational service at the present time includes industrial instructors, recreation instructors and other miscellaneous instructors. The main body of teachers is at present under the control of the board of education and their salaries are fixed by law. At some time in the future it may be thought advisable to bring the salaries of these teachers under the control of the board of estimate.

The investigational service was planned to include the higher type of examiners and investigators in central staff agencies, and in public charitable and social work.

The inspectional service was created to include health, trade, building, public works, safety and other inspections involving a kind of observation and inquiry more routine and stereotyped than that included in the investigational service.

The reasons for creating the clerical service are obvious. The word "clerical" is a very comprehensive term and under it may be included all kinds of office work not requiring particular training and skill of the kinds set forth in the other services.

The custodial service was created to provide for work closely related to laboring work but of a character involving the custody of public property, such as the work of caretakers, janitors, watchmen, storekeepers, bridgetenders, animal keepers, etc.

The reasons for creating a street cleaning, police and fire service are self-explanatory. These are the large specialized uniformed forces of the city. It is true that the rank and file of the street cleaning department are very close to laborers and that the police are close to inspectors, investigators and watchmen, but these forces have peculiar identities and duties of their own and no purpose could be served by classifying them otherwise than separately and individually.

The institutional service is another service which is not entirely functional and does not include all employees in the city performing a certain kind of work. It includes in general all employees in institutions other than professional workers, from helpers and artisans up to and including lay administrators. The institutional problem is a peculiar and difficult one. A helper in an institution who receives maintenance may be doing work very similar to that of a laborer or skilled laborer in other departments, but the conditions of employment and salary are so different from those of employees in other departments as to constitute for purposes of classification a separate and distinct kind of employment.

The skilled trades service includes the recognized skilled trades—mostly unionized trades—and, in addition, a few classes of employees, such as fire telegraph despatchers and employees on city boats, who have been placed in this service because the work is more accurately classified in this service than in any other. There is a great advantage in keeping the skilled trades, particularly the unionized trades, together, since the problem of determining prevailing rates or of setting up annual salaries for these employees should be dealt with as a whole.

The labor service includes laborers, skilled laborers and miscellaneous supervisors of laborers not included in the skilled trades service or the custodial service—in general, employments requiring manual strength or the ability to supervise manual workers rather than any particular skill along specialized lines.

These services were sub-divided into groups and the groups sub-divided into grades, distinguishing the specific work to be performed by individual employees and an appropriate range of

salary, the difference between grades being based upon clearly discernible facts as to the importance, difficulty, responsibility and value of the work.

Provision was originally made to include a managerial service, taking into consideration officials other than the supreme executives, such as superintendents of bureaus of buildings and offices, ferries, docks, parks, the chief of the fire prevention bureau, etc., with the idea that these positions, although associated with particular groups in other services, for example, the heads of the bureaus of buildings with the inspectors of buildings in the inspectional service, the chief of the fire prevention bureau with the inspectors of fire prevention, the heads of the bureaus of public buildings and offices with the caretakers and janitors of these buildings, would not and should not be in the line of promotion in these other services, and that they constituted positions for which general administrative ability and experience constitute the primary qualifications, rather than experience along any particular specialized lines. However, after considerable discussion it was decided to abandon this service because it was found impossible to limit the number of positions included in it and because it complicated the classification, in that it entirely separated certain administrative positions at the head of groups of employees from these groups of employees. It was also found that a considerable number of these administrative positions really required a long service in specialized lines rather than general administrative ability and experience. Moreover, in fixing salaries for these positions they could not be considered as isolated administrative positions but had to be considered in relation to the groups of employees under supervision. It was therefore finally decided to place these positions at the head of the groups with which they were most closely associated. For example, the caretaker group in the custodial service includes positions all the way from that of attendant in a bath to that of superintendent of public buildings and offices, even though the superintendent of public buildings and offices may be an exempt officer appointed not because he has had experience as a cleaner, caretaker and janitor, but because in the opinion of the appoint-

ing officer he has sufficient administrative ability and experience to put him in charge of the maintenance of public buildings.

In general, it was the practice of the bureau of standards to base its specifications for each group upon a field report made by examiners who had studied the organizations in which the work outlined in this group was performed, the duties of employees, etc.

In fixing the rates of compensation in each grade the bureau of standards based its recommendations upon the following principles:

1. That a range of salary should be paid in each grade beginning somewhat lower than the average rate being paid by liberal private employers and other government agencies and proceeding by gradual increases extending over several years to a maximum rate about 10 per cent higher than this liberal average paid by other employers. It was found that it would be impossible to base salary ranges only upon salaries prevailing in other employments since there were found to be positions in the city service for which there was no parallel in private employment and since in the case of other positions, it was found that there were conditions peculiar to the New York City service, as well as conditions inherent in all government services, which made it necessary to interpret figures obtained from private employers and other government agencies in the light of New York City needs and common sense.

2. That New York City wished as far as it was financially able to be a model employer. Following this principle, the bureau of standards made an exhaustive study of a minimum wage for an unskilled laborer's family. The conclusion reached in this study was that a family consisting of an unskilled laborer, his wife and three children could not at the period of maximum family expense and demand live decently on less than \$840 per year. It was therefore decided to increase the maximum compensation for street cleaners and other unskilled laborers to at least \$840 on the theory that a laborer should be willing to enter the city service at a low salary while he is still young, and has few family responsibilities, on the understanding that he would receive increases in salary up to the maximum which should be

sufficient to take care of him and his family at the time of maximum responsibilities.

In making temporary adjustments to the new scale proposed for the rank and file in the street cleaning department, about \$150,000 was spent in the last two budgets. This is interesting because it shows clearly how large a sum is involved in making some adjustments in salary affecting a large number of employees. An increase of \$24 a year looks very picayune until multiplied by 3000 employees. The existence of small armies of slightly underpaid employees should never be lost sight of in making preliminary estimates of savings through standardization. As a matter of fact, in the majority of large cities, it is safe to say that savings can be made through standardization only by ultimately abolishing large numbers of unnecessary positions and not merely by unpaid and downward adjustments to standard grades, however drastic. It is generally found that for every single employee, clerk or stenographer, who is drawing a \$3,000 salary for \$1200 work, there are ten sweepers or cleaners who are \$60 below grade.

The specifications initially drawn up by the bureau of standards for each group in accordance with the principles outlined above were in almost all cases submitted for criticism at conferences attended by administrative officers, employees and experts from private employment. Numerous modifications were made as a result of these conferences. Since there are about 150 groups in all, and it is difficult to hold more than two such conferences a week and at the same time keep the field work running smoothly and correspondence up to date, it is apparent that there must be some limit to public discussion. The specifications as amended after conferences were published in a first edition and were used in making up the 1916 budget.

The history of the making of this budget is interesting. The city was face to face with a large and unexpected state tax of some \$14,000,000. The fusion administration was confronted with the seeming necessity of cutting the non-mandatory part of the budget to the lowest possible total, in spite of the legitimate demands of department heads for increased service. The

preliminary estimates indicated large increases. It was suggested that necessary savings could be made only by standardizing salaries, that is, by fixing salaries of employees in accordance with standard grades and by eliminating unnecessary positions. The mayor and comptroller declared for a drastic policy of cutting salaries and eliminating unnecessary positions. The borough presidents were opposed but offered no alternative. The president of the board of aldermen did not at this time go on record. The budget sub-committee proceeded to pass upon the first budgets which came before it on the theory that drastic adjustments to standard grades were to be made, or, as the phrase went, that they were "to cut to the bone." Considerable opposition developed not only among civil service employees but also on the part of newspapers and the public. Numerous appeals were made to the main committee of the board. The pressure for a more equitable and humane system of standardization became so great that it was resolved in a final revision of the estimates to adopt a more liberal policy, but instead of a definite plan for cutting salaries it was practically decided to take up each individual case on its merits. The result was that every argument known to public service was brought to bear to save individuals from being reduced in salary. In general, there was almost no criticism of the specifications on which the appraisals were based. There was considerable criticism of individual appraisals in one grade or another, but in the main it was felt that the appraisals were just. The position of the bureau of standards and the bureau of contract supervision, an engineering bureau of the board of estimate which assisted in the budget analysis, was anomalous.

The members of the board of estimate were not unanimously behind the salary standardization program at all. So far as could be judged, the borough presidents were opposed to all standardization downward and apparently very little in favor of any kind of standardization, nor did the other members of the board stand together in the formulation of any definite policy. The examiners who worked on the budget were therefore in the unpleasant position of making all the recommendations for cuts,

of having no definite policy to pursue and no united board of estimate to back them up. Opposition from heads of departments where budgets were being cut was of course to be expected. It must also be remembered that the board of estimate in the making of the budget is a judicial body which must decide on their merits, differences of opinion between examiners and department heads, but it would not have been unreasonable to suppose that a fusion board of estimate definitely committed to a program of standardization could unite on a policy of standardization which could be applied almost mechanically in all cases. However, the result of the budget conferences was that substantial adjustments were made in salaries of employees; that the reductions were considerably modified through the application of a more humane principle of cutting and in a few cases through pressure or influence. A very large number of employees, particularly in the lower grades, such as sweepers and cleaners, received increases. The work on the budget showed plainly that the number of employees favorably affected was larger than the number adversely affected by salary standardization. The great savings lay in reduction in numbers of superfluous employees.

When the budget reached the board of aldermen all increases in salary above \$2500 were vetoed by that board and several new and necessary positions were also vetoed. An attempt was also made to abolish the bureau of standards but this was defeated by a very narrow margin. The mayor, however, vetoed the cuts of the board of aldermen and the board failed to pass its cuts over the mayor's veto. The 1916 budget therefore represents a very substantial application of the salary specifications. Much confusion, however, has resulted owing to the fact that titles in the new specifications were placed in the budget which did not correspond to the titles at present in the civil service classification. In order to avoid further confusion it is necessary that the civil service commission adopt the titles, grades, definitions of duties, qualifications and conditions governing promotion in the new standard specifications at the earliest possible moment.

It will be remembered that the civil service commission was

represented on the original sub-committee on standardization in 1912. Since that time the civil service commission has been represented at numerous conferences and it is due to lack of complete understanding as to the coöperation necessary between the civil service commission and the bureau of standards that it is now necessary to hold further conferences in order to settle differences of opinion. When the civil service commission has agreed to the titles, grades, definitions of duties, qualifications and conditions governing promotion in the new standard specifications, the consent of the mayor and the state civil service commission has been obtained, and the new classification has been adopted, it will remain to give to each employee his new standard title and grade. This adjustment of titles and grades is now being studied. It involves technical and legal questions which cannot be settled in a day. It is almost certain to involve some action by the board of aldermen and may require an enabling act of the state legislature. It is possible that the ultimate application of the new titles and grades of all employees must wait until the 1917 budget is adopted.

In the meantime, the civil service commission has published and is installing a new system of efficiency or service records for all employees based upon a comprehensive report submitted by the bureau of municipal research, with the intention that these records shall form the basis under the standard specifications for all regular increases in salary within grades. The new plan merely prescribes the skeleton of the service record system and the form and method of computation and final records. It is contemplated that existing accounting or administrative records will be coördinated with the final service records or that other supporting records will be developed. It must be admitted that in the case of a very large number of employees service ratings must be based largely upon the judgment of superiors and not upon reviewable facts. It is however possible to impress rating officers with the importance and the judicial nature of their work and to organize a division in the civil service commission which will be constantly in touch with the various departments and will check and review all records. If this plan is realized, it will be

possible definitely to promise employees, especially in the lower grades, regular annual or other increases in salary provided they attain a certain mark on their service records.

It is evident from the foregoing that a large part of the work for which the bureau of standards was created is almost completed. It is therefore pertinent to review the past work and discuss the future of the bureau of standards.

During the last year the functions of the bureau of standards have been as follows:

1. To prepare standard supply specification and to assist in the preparation of the supply items of the 1916 budget.
 2. To prepare standard salary and grade specifications.
 3. To report to the board of estimate upon the filling of current vacancies.
 4. To examine and make recommendations affecting personal service in the 1916 budget.
 5. To prepare charts for budget and administrative use, indicating the present and proper organization of city departments.
- The work under the first function is almost complete and what remains of this function has been transferred to another bureau to take effect on January 1, 1916.

The second function has been discussed at length above. A second and revised edition of the standard specifications including the suggestions made by the civil service commission is about to be published for the board of estimates and apportionment. Presumably this will be a final edition although that board has steadily refused to commit itself to any final approval.

The third, fourth and fifth functions, involving the current and budgetary application of salary and grade specifications and the study of the present and proper organization of departments must necessarily be carried on by some central agency. This agency might be in the finance department under the comptroller, in the office of the commissioners of accounts under the mayor, it might be a bureau under the board of estimate or it might be a bureau under the civil service commission. There are objections to every one of these plans. If the mayor and presidents of the boroughs object to having this agency in the finance

department, the control of the filling of current vacancies and the examination of the budget were originally functions of the finance department, and there would be objection to transferring them back. The commissioners of accounts in this relation would act only for the mayor's departments in their investigational work. It is extremely doubtful whether it would be wise to add to the present judicial functions of the civil service commission the duty of making organization studies and criticising the budget. There is also little logic in the present organization of the bureau of standards and other bureaus under the board of estimates. A number of members of the board of estimate do not favor the retention of the bureau of standards as at present constituted and are definitely opposed to any extension of its functions. With the work for which it was originally established almost complete, the bureau of standards is face to face with the need of a definite program supported by the board of estimates. It must either find a function or become ridiculous.

There is a class of employees in a number of cities, where an executive budget procedure has been established, who are known as budget men. They are men who work night and day three months in the year in the preparation, review and criticism of budgets. At the end of these three months they take a vacation which lasts nine months, or, in other words, until it is necessary to begin work on the next budget. Unless the bureau of standards is given the function of studying the proper organization of departments, of bringing about adjustments and reducing the number of employees, it will become an agency paid on an annual basis for three months' work.

Unfortunately there is no time remaining to discuss standardization work in other cities and states. There is a very interesting standardization study of New York state employees going on in Albany at the present time under the direction of the senate committee on civil service, in which the bureau of municipal research is also coöperating. Certain deductions can, however, be made from all these standardization studies which may be of use to other cities and states which contemplate making similar studies:

1. When a program for standardization work is first made, great care should be taken in determining what executive or other agency is to be responsible for the work. An effort should be made to get the persons who are to be responsible to pledge themselves to stand squarely behind the program. Without executive support field data cannot be collected, definite conclusions cannot be reached, and endless recriminations delay the work.

There is no other large program involving simplification and improvement in government which calls for more courage and integrity on the part of responsible executives than a salary standardization program. Even though many classes of employees are favorably affected and all future employees will benefit from the program, there is bound to be a great deal of ignorance and opposition to overcome and the opportunities for favoritism, especially in appraising the work of individuals and in the application of new standards are numberless.

2. In selecting examiners and investigators, it is well to avoid introducing in the standardizing agency the same conditions as regards character and conduct of personnel which this agency aims to abolish in other departments. A standardization agency should be a model agency in the plan and conduct of its work. Nothing can make salary standardization more ridiculous than to put it into the hands of lazy or incompetent examiners. There is a peculiar kind of critical mind which is of particular value in making such studies. An examiner who is not vitally interested in his work is of no value; an examiner who has too many close friends in city departments and who is susceptible to their influence is of no value; an examiner who in collecting information, preparing specifications or making appraisals always wishes to take the "human factor" into consideration is a dangerous man to associate with such work. The consideration of the "human factor" is entirely a matter of policy for policy determining bodies in applying salary and grade specifications. The examiners who prepare these specifications should prepare them on the theory that they are to fit a new generation of employees. It is no business of theirs to make adjustments to present condi-

tions in preparing schedules which are to be applied to future employees.

3. It is necessary to establish a close coöperation with the civil service commission if the standardization work is not done in the civil service commission itself.

4. It is essential to have a more or less definite understanding as to the time and money to be spent on standardization work. Salary standardization is at best a long and tedious process, if it is to be done well, but there is a difference between time and eternity.

I believe that the final results of the work in New York City will be regarded as entirely satisfactory but it is well to remember that this work commenced in 1912 and that about \$400,000 has been spent in bringing about the desired results. It is futile to attempt to establish beyond doubt who of the many agencies involved in salary standardization work is responsible for delays and set backs.

5. When salary and grade specifications have been prepared and the question arises as to their application either in a budget or for current use, experience indicates that drastic adjustments upward and downward arouse every form of political and personal opposition known in government and are likely to wreck a whole program. A very powerful executive willing to risk his political future, or an executive face to face with the universal demand for a reduced budget can succeed in making a drastic and complete standardization of all salaries. Something like this was done in Pittsburgh. It is, however, a very unsafe procedure and there are many sound arguments other than those of political expediency against it. Employees who have served for years in an unstandardized civil service and who have formed certain habits of life in accordance with their salaries, are at least entitled to some consideration in adjusting their salaries to new and unexpected standards.

6. If it is decided not to make complete and drastic adjustments and, on the other hand, not merely to wait to apply the specifications to new-comers in the service, it is essential to have a definite and almost a mechanical program of adjustments in

order to avoid personal and political pressure and charges of favoritism. A plan such as that carried out in New York City in the preparation of the 1916 budget, involving no definite principle, excepting that of reasonable treatment of individuals, is almost worse in its effect upon employees than a drastic program which does not take individuals into consideration at all. The moment an executive body listens to every plea for an individual, the public, and particularly city employees, refuse to believe that any principle has governed the final decisions, as, in the case of New York City, when a number of restorations were made in salaries, which could not be explained satisfactorily, every employee made up his mind that there was influence behind it and that standardization was like other great reform principles—a very accurate and mathematical thing on paper but a totally different thing in its application to individuals.

7. When standardization has been put into effect and incorporated into budget and financial procedures and civil service rules and regulations, definite provision must be made for keeping it up to date and for natural expansion and change along logical lines. Unless this is done the titles, grades and salaries of employees will soon degenerate into the same chaotic state which existed before standardization.